

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending. The office action mailed December 31, 2008, objected to claim 1 because lines 5-6 recited the terms, “said network copies” and “the mobile node copies,” for which there was no antecedent basis. Claims 1 and 15 were also objected to because of the term, “thereof” in line 11. Claim 15 was also objected to because line 16 should have read “network part” in the phrase, “at least one of the network and at the mobile node....”

In addition to the foregoing objections, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,966,714 to Huang et al. (Huang) in view of U.S. patent 7,035,878 to Multer et al. (Multer). The Examiner asserted that Huang discloses all of the claim’s limitations except the claimed formatter. The Examiner also asserted that Multer discloses the formatter and that since Huang and Multer are in the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Multer with the teachings of Huang. Claims 2-14 were rejected on similar grounds, i.e., the combined teachings of Huang and Multer.

As for claim 15, which is an independent method claim, the Examiner asserted that Huang discloses all of the limitations of claim 15, except the step of appending an identifier to a change list. The Examiner asserted that Multer discloses the step of appending an identifier and that since Huang and Multer are in the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Multer with the teachings of Huang. Claims 16-20 were rejected on similar grounds, i.e., the combined teachings of Huang and Multer.

Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to extract the limitations added by the applicant’s last response. The claims thus no longer recite (or require) multiple different databases in either the network part or the mobile node and, extracting the previously-made revisions overcomes the above-identified objections. The claims have instead been amended to recite that databases in the mobile node and in the network part are comprised of text-formatted databases utilizing an Extensible Mark-Up Language (XML) format.

Application No. 10/775,825  
Amendment dated March 31, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 31, 2008

No new matter has been added by the claim amendments. Paragraph [0034] of the application as published by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office states in pertinent part that, “the ... databases are text-formatted... utilizing an Extensible Mark-Up Language (XML) format.” (Emphasis added.)

Among other things, the use of XML facilitates the creation of documents that can be used on different computing platforms and that retain their formatting, indexing from one computer to the next. Among other things, the apparatus and method recited in the amended claims may enable the network synchronization of databases stored in mobile devices with different architectures, including devices made by different manufacturers.

Thus, the XML databases recited in claims 1 and 15 can be, among other things, platform-independent. By virtue of these characteristics, the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 15 allows more flexibility in the structure of the database than would be possible using the databases in either Huang or Multer.

Neither Huang nor Multer disclose or suggest the use of XML-format records as the amended claims require. The Applicant therefore believes that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

---

Robert H. Kelly  
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.  
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
Telephone: (214) 446-6684  
Fax: (214) 446-6692  
[robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com](mailto:robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com)